<div align="center">REMARKS</div>

Claims 1-6 and 8-23 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 14, and 18 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-4 of the Reply. Claim 7 has been canceled.

Applicant's representative thanks Examiner Chow for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview conducted on August 9, 2007. The Examiner was contacted to discuss proposed amendments to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102, 103, and 112, and interpretation of the cited prior art references with respect to limitations of independent claims 1, 14, and 18. No agreement was reached.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. **Rejection of Claims 1-6 and 8-17 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph**

Claims 1-6 and 8-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 1 has been amended and is hereby submitted to be definite. Regarding claim 14, the specification does state "At 3710, base tables are set-up in the data store associated with the system or platform that will be executing the installed application (*e.g,* information agent system data store 150). The base tables are subsequently updated with application data at 3720, rather than creating new tables and databases strictly for the installed application. At 3730, application procedures are stored as data, for instance, in a based-table designated for application procedures. To execute, an application procedure strings of text are removed from a database and executed according to one aspect in real-time." So to answer the question posed in the office action, yes, the base tables are set-up in the data store. Claim 14 has been amended to clarify this point and is submitted to be definite. Therefore the rejection should be withdrawn.

II. **Rejection of Claims 1-5, 11-13, 18-21 and 23 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 1-5, 11-13, 18-21 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Yamanoue (US 6,745,180). Applicants' representative respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Yamanoue fails to disclose all limitations of the claimed subject matter.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it *expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim*. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.,* 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California,* 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). *The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim*. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.,* 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

The claimed subject matter relates to an information agent system, application, and methodology. An information agent system provides the platform for executing information agent applications (IA). IA applications can then be programmed by end-users and employed as end-user executive assistants or agents. Agents can then act to greatly enhance end-user personal productivity, integrate desktop applications and all personal communication mediums (*e.g.*, mobile phone, pager, PDA...). Specifically, claim 1 recites a preference execution system, comprising: *a data store component for storing schematized data and end-user preferences; a compiler to compile information agent applications including end-user specified preferences and store the compiled information agent applications in the data store; and an execution engine to retrieve preferences stored in the data store upon the occurrence of one or more events and to utilize the preferences and at least one stored procedure to query tables within the data store and produce a results table, wherein the results table stores preferences whose conditions have been satisfied such that specified actions are triggered based on the stored preferences* (claim 18 recites similar features). Yamanoue fails to disclose such claimed aspects.

Yamanoue describes a data supply controlling device that comprises a data base for user data which stores user data matched with each user. The data base of user data can be queried in accordance with the user data so that a data server performs a search according to the query and stores the search results in a search result data base. User ID management can be performed for separately managing the identifying data to identify each user and user specifying data to specify each user. A search result matched with the identifying data of the user from the search results stored in the search result data base is provide for a user terminal. Once the user data is stored, it is not required to carry out further communications to input the user data. (*See* col. 2, lines 26-53).

In contrast, applicants' claimed subject matter discloses a preference execution system. The system comprises a data store, a multitude of tables, a preference execution engine and a results table. Data store houses a multitude of tables, which are produced by system from a developer schema as well as end-user preferences. As a result of the occurrence of an event, preference execution engine receives or retrieves preferences, for example from a table stored in data store. Execution engine then utilizes the preferences as well as some stored procedures (which can also be stored as data) to query tables and produce a results table. Result table can store the preferences whose conditions have been satisfied such that specified actions can be commenced thereon. (*See* pg. 37, lines 7-16).

Yamanoue merely discloses generating a query based on user data stored in a user data storage section and supplying data based on the query. Thus, a search result that is suitable to each user can be presented to the user. Yamanoue does not disclose utilizing preferences and stored procedures to produce a results table, such that specified actions are triggered based on the stored preferences. Accordingly, Yamanoue is silent with respect to ...*an execution engine to retrieve preferences stored in the data store upon the occurrence of one or more events and to utilize the preferences and at least one stored procedure to query tables within the data store and produce a results table, wherein the results table stores preferences whose conditions have been satisfied such that specified actions are triggered based on the stored preferences.*

Additionally Yamanoue does not disclose *a compiler to compile information agent applications including end-user specified preferences and store them in the data store.* Although Yamanoue may state that "After the data compiled or read in S64 or S65 is sent to the user terminal 1 by the data supplying means 41, the data is displayed in detail on the display 15 of the user terminal 1 (S66)." Column 22 lines 5-8. It is respectfully submitted that Yamanoue discloses generic compiling and not compiling that includes *information agent applications including end-user specified preferences.*

In view of at least the foregoing it is readily apparent that Yamanoue does not teach the identical subject matter in as complete detail as is contained in independent claims 1 and 18 (and the claims that depend there from). Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

III.   Rejection of Claims 14-17 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(a)

Claims 14-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Delo (US

6,606,618). Applicants' representative respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Delo fails to disclose all limitations of the claimed subject matter.

As stated *supra*, the claimed subject matter relates to an information agent system, application, and methodology. An information agent system provides the platform for executing IA applications that can then be programmed by end-users and employed as end-user executive assistants or agents. Specifically, claim 14 recites a method for application installation comprising: *establishing a set of base tables in a data store; storing program actions, conditions, events and procedures as data in the data store; and updating the base tables with application data associated with an application being installed by retrieving program text from the data store and executing the program text*. Delo fails to disclose such claimed aspects.

Delo describes a relational installation database system. The data fields underlying a database table are two-dimensional data arrays. Aliasing the non-integer data elements of a database table with integers causes the data arrays to be uniform. Thus, manipulation of the data arrays is simplified. The system provides for the direct addition of temporary rows and columns to a database table by expanding and contracting the underlying data arrays. Data elements in the permanent rows and columns persist in the database, while data elements in the temporary rows and columns do not persist. (*See* col. 2, line 49-col. 3, line 7).

In contrast applicants' claimed subject matter discloses an application installation system and method. In conventional systems, application installation involves a proliferation of database objects, tables, and stored procedures. In some instances applications create whole new databases. The claimed subject matter simplifies and expedites application installation by providing a set of base tables. To install an application, the system simply updates the base tables. This can be accomplished by storing program actions, conditions, events, and procedures as data. For example, with respect to procedures, they can be created as a roll of text, which is stored in a data store. To run such procedures the program text can simply be pulled out of data store and executed. (*See* pg. 4, lines 18-26).

Delo merely discloses storing data elements in the form of strings, objects, *etc.*, which are aliased with integer identifiers corresponding to each data element. Delo does not disclose providing a set of base tables and updating the base tables to install an application. Accordingly, Delo is silent with respect to ...*establishing a set of base tables in a data store; storing program actions, conditions, events and procedures as data in the data store; and updating the base*

8

tables with application data associated with an application being installed by retrieving
program text from the data store and executing the program text.

It is respectfully submitted that "locating a record" is not equivalent to "retrieving program text", the first phrase arguably broader than the second. Additionally, it is respectfully submitted that "processing the query" is not equivalent to "executing the program", the first phrase arguably broader than the second.

In view of at least the foregoing it is readily apparent that Delo does not teach the identical subject matter in as complete detail as is contained in independent claim 14 (and the claims that depend there from). Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

IV.   Rejection of Claims 6, 8, 9, 10 and 22 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 6, 8, 9, 10, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamanoue, in view of Omoigui (US 2003/0126136). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. Yamanoue and Omoigui, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims. In particular, Omoigui does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Yamanoue with respect to independent claims 1 and 18 (which claims 6, 8, 9, 10 and 22 respectively depend there from). Thus, the claimed subject matter as recited in claims 6, 8, 9, 10 and 22 is not obvious over the combination of Yamanoue and Omoigui, and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP545US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731